

REMARKS

Applicant hereby affirms the election to proceed with examination of the invention of claims 11-20. Claims 1-10 and 21-33 are cancelled without prejudice.

The Examiner rejected claim 6 (sic--11?) under 35 U. S. C. § 112. The Examiner questions the meaning of the term “high-magnitude,” as used in the phrase “high-magnitude electrostatic potential.” The references cited in the background portion of this application, however, plainly support the use of this term. For example, U. S. Patent 3,787,707 col. 1, line 10, refers to “voltages of 40,000 volts or higher;” U. S. Patent 3,844,477 col. 5, lines 54-55, refers to “voltages of 40,000 up to 100,000 volts or more;” U. S. Patent 3,873,024 col. 3, lines 65-67, refers to “voltages of about 40,000 to 100,000 volts or more;” U. S. Patent 5,598,099 col. 2, line 9 refers to “a potential of 40,000 volts or higher,” and col. 5, lines 32-34 refers to “the high voltage source which may operate between 60,000-120,000 volts;” U. S. Patent 5,824,403 col. 4, line 23 refers to “a 65-120 kV voltage for field generation;” U. S. Patent 5,949,235 col. 2, lines 3-4 refers to “charging the coating material at a potential of 40,000 volts or higher;” col. 5, lines 32-34 refers to “the high voltage source [, which] may operate between 60,000-120,000 volts;” and, col. 6, lines 64-65 refers to “the high voltage source 36 (supplying between 60,000-120,000 Volts DC).” Applicant submits that there is ample evidence in the record to support a recitation of high-magnitude electrostatic potential in the claims.

The Examiner rejected claims 11-15 and 17-20 under 35 U. S. C. § 102. The Examiner relied upon DeWent published U. S. patent application 2002/0015798 (hereinafter DeWent) to support this rejection.

Claim 11, from which the remaining rejected claims all depend, either directly or indirectly, has been amended to recite “coupling articles to a conveyor on hangers constructed from electrically non-insulative strips of foil or tape.” This element of claims 11-15 and 17-20 is neither disclosed nor suggested by DeWent, which discloses rigid conductive supports 8 coated with material, for example, conductive silicone, sleeves 10, 20, 22; rigid conductive supports 44 including cross bars 50 provided with conductive sleeves 40, 56, 60, 64, 66, 70, 74 provided with slits 42, 58, 62, 68, 72, 75 permitting the sleeves 40, 56, 60, 64, 66, 70, 74 to be placed over cross bars 50 and conductive hooks 52 to be engaged over the sleeves 40, 56, 60, 64, 66, 70, 74, with the hooks 52 then supporting the articles 45 to be coated; rigid conductive supports 5 coated with adhesive 82 backed strips 80, 85, 84, 86 of conductive silicone; rigid conductive supports 5 covered by strips 90 of conductive silicone attached by peel-off layers 94-protected adhesive strips; circular 96, trapezoidal 100,

generally diamond shaped 104 and generally rectangular 106 patches of conductive silicone with peripheral 98, central 97, side 102, and overall 105 coatings of adhesive; rigid conductive supports 110, 120, 122, 124, 125 partially 116 or completely 118 coated, for example, by immersion in a coating bath 112, 114 with a pliable conductive coating; loop type rigid conductive supports 126 attached to a conductive crossbar 130, with the rigid conductive supports 126 coated by a pliable conductive silicone; pliable conductive caps or sleeves 130, 138 for receiving rigid conductive supports 135; and, pliable conductive sleeves 140 having different diameter sections 144, 145 for receiving rigid conductive supports.

Since DeWent neither discloses nor suggests this specifically recited limitation of amended claim 11, or claims 12-15 and 17-20 which depend either directly or indirectly from amended claim 11, the 35 U. S. C. § 102 rejection of claims 11-15 and 17-20 based upon DeWent is overcome.

The Examiner rejected claim 16 under 35 U. S. C. § 103. The Examiner again relies upon DeWent to support this rejection. Claim 16 depends indirectly from claim 11. As previously noted, claim 11 has been amended to recite “coupling articles to a conveyor on hangers constructed from electrically non-insulative strips of foil or tape.” This element of claim 11, and by its dependency from claim 11, claim 16, is neither disclosed nor suggested by DeWent, which discloses rigid conductive supports 8 coated with material, for example, conductive silicone, sleeves 10, 20, 22; rigid conductive supports 44 including cross bars 50 provided with conductive sleeves 40, 56, 60, 64, 66, 70, 74 provided with slits 42, 58, 62, 68, 72, 75 permitting the sleeves 40, 56, 60, 64, 66, 70, 74 to be placed over cross bars 50 and conductive hooks 52 to be engaged over the sleeves 40, 56, 60, 64, 66, 70, 74, with the hooks 52 then supporting the articles 45 to be coated; rigid conductive supports 5 coated with adhesive 82 backed strips 80, 85, 84, 86 of conductive silicone; rigid conductive supports 5 covered by strips 90 of conductive silicone attached by peel-off layers 94-protected adhesive strips; circular 96, trapezoidal 100, generally diamond shaped 104 and generally rectangular 106 patches of conductive silicone with peripheral 98, central 97, side 102, and overall 105 coatings of adhesive; rigid conductive supports 110, 120, 122, 124, 125 partially 116 or completely 118 coated, for example, by immersion in a coating bath 112, 114 with a pliable conductive coating; loop type rigid conductive supports 126 attached to a conductive crossbar 130, with the rigid conductive supports 126 coated by a pliable conductive silicone; pliable conductive caps or sleeves 130, 138 for receiving rigid conductive supports 135; and, pliable conductive sleeves 140 having different diameter sections 144, 145 for receiving rigid conductive supports.

Since DeWent neither discloses nor suggests this specifically recited limitation of amended claim 16, the 35 U. S. C. § 103 rejection of claim 16 based upon DeWent is overcome.

Accordingly, Applicant submits that his claims 11-20, as amended herein, are entitled to further favorable consideration, culminating in allowance. Such action is respectfully requested.

Should any fees be due to constitute this a timely response to the March 15, 2005 official action, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any such fees to Applicant's undersigned counsel's deposit account 10-0435, with reference to file 3030-74406. A duplicate copy of this authorization is enclosed for that purpose.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Richard D. Conard", written in a cursive style.

Richard D. Conard
Registration No. 27321
Attorney for Applicant

(317) 231-7285
Indianapolis, Indiana 46204
INDS02 RDC 735554